



Urban water management: Can UN SDG 6 be met within the Planetary Boundaries?

Sørup, Hjalte Jomo Danielsen; Brudler, Sarah; Godskesen, Berit; Dong, Yan; Lerer, Sara Maria; Rygaard, Martin; Arnbjerg-Nielsen, Karsten

Published in:
Environmental Science and Policy

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1016/j.envsci.2020.01.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.01.015)

Publication date:
2020

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Sørup, H. J. D., Brudler, S., Godskesen, B., Dong, Y., Lerer, S. M., Rygaard, M., & Arnbjerg-Nielsen, K. (2020). Urban water management: Can UN SDG 6 be met within the Planetary Boundaries? *Environmental Science and Policy*, 106, 36-39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.01.015>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Urban water management: Can UN SDG 6 be met within the Planetary Boundaries?

Hjalte JD Sørup^{1,*}, Sarah Brudler^{1,2}, Berit Godskesen¹, Yan Dong³, Sara M Lerer¹, Martin Rygaard¹, Karsten Arnbjerg-Nielsen¹

¹ Technical University of Denmark, Department of Environmental Engineering

² VCS Denmark

³ Technical University of Denmark, Department of Management Engineering

* Corresponding author: hjds@env.dtu.dk

Abstract

Water is key to keeping urban areas safe and healthy for humans and hence safe sanitation and waste water treatment is promoted by the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. We show that emissions from existing state-of-the-art water technologies are problematic from a Planetary Boundaries (PBs) perspective. The magnitude of the climate change impact in relation to the PB based normalization is much higher than for any other PB. The current paradigm for urban water management needs a radical change for society to be served while emissions are reduced to a level that complies with the Planetary Boundaries.

Keywords

Life Cycle Assessment; Planetary Boundaries; Sustainable Water Management; United Nations Sustainable Development Goals; Urban Water Management

20 Introduction

21 Water is used to establish barriers between humans and potential threats (hygienic and other) which has
22 been of major importance for the historic development of human society and human health (Ferriman,
23 2007). As such, urban water management is essential for urbanization as set forth in the United Nations
24 Sustainable Development Goal (UN SDG) 6 on Water and sustainable management of water is key for
25 creating sustainable communities (UN SDG 11 on cities) (United Nations, 2015). Urban water management
26 incorporates withdrawal of water for consumption purposes (Godskesen et al., 2013; Lundie et al., 2004),
27 handling of wastewater to maintain barriers between humans and hazards (Brudler et al., 2019; Corominas
28 et al., 2013; Delre et al., 2019; Fang et al., 2016; Wenzel et al., 2008), and stormwater management to
29 dampen climatic fluctuations from droughts to flooding (Brudler et al., 2016; Green, 2010).

30 Urbanization changes the natural water cycle substantially (Figure 1). This change is generally considered
31 inevitable to fulfil human needs (Ferriman, 2007). It is also increasingly recognized that water systems must
32 be sustainable with respect to all three pillars of sustainability, i.e. to provide these services with due
33 consideration to economy, society and the environment (Belmeziti et al., 2015; Larsen et al., 2016). Hence
34 the question in the title: can we live up to UN SDG 6 and spread modern urban water management to all
35 people in the world without compromising environmental sustainability?




Figure 1 The urban water cycle as presented in Denmark with: A) groundwater based water supply, B) wastewater and stormwater collection systems, C) wastewater treatment including nutrient removal, and D) protection against pluvial flooding. CSO is short for Combined Sewer Overflow.

Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) is a widely accepted and internationally standardized tool to assess environmental sustainability and has been applied within all areas of urban water management to compare management approaches and technological options (Brudler et al., 2019, 2016; Corominas et al., 2013; Delre et al., 2019; Fang et al., 2016; Foley et al., 2010; Wenzel et al., 2008). However, marginal improvements may not be sufficient to ensure overall environmental sustainability (Bjørn and Hauschild, 2015; Ryberg et al., 2016). Hence, there is a need to map the best available practices against the definitions of the Planetary Boundaries (PB) where the goal is to keep the Earth System within the stable environmental state of the Holocene (Rockström et al., 2009; Steffen et al., 2015). If PBs should not be

exceeded, it is necessary to downscale to a more local level to guide strategies and define thresholds(Bjørn and Hauschild, 2015).

Methods

Data from four existing LCA studies are used in this study


- Water supply: Copenhagen, Denmark: 535 000 people receiving service (Godskesen et al., 2013)
- Wastewater treatment: Copenhagen, Denmark: 520 000 people receiving service (Delre et al., 2019)
- Stormwater managemet: Odense, Denmark: 14 000 people receiving service (Brudler et al., 2019)
- Climate change adaptation: Copenhagen, Denmark: 79 000 people receiving service (Brudler et al., 2016)

The different studies, even though most of them from Copenhagen, Denmark, do not cover the exact same spatial areas and thus serve different numbers of people. The system boundaries of the original studies are investigated and adjusted to avoid double counting of any processes, see [Supplementary material].

Each study is re-referenced to a common functional unit relating to the provision of essential societal water services for one person. The impacts arising from each of the service functions is allocated per person according to the number of people benefiting from the service function. That way, the impacts can be compared across studies. In the [Supplementary material] all PBs are investigated, showing that climate change emissions is by far the category with the highest PB exceedance and at the same time the category with the best data coverage. Hence, this is the category focused on in this study. The total allowable GHGs emissions for the number of people receiving the services is calculated using the very strict PB based normalization value of 522 kg CO₂-eq per person per year provided by (Bjørn and Hauschild, 2015). This corresponds to an allowed global warming of 1 W/m² and is thus more strict than e.g. the Paris agreement, but still very relevant given the current lack of reductions in actual emissions, and consequential future needs for faster reductions (UNEP, 2019). Finally, the emissions per person from the different services are related to the total allowable emissions of a person as the share a given service is occupying.

73 Results and discussion

74 While existing LCAs of urban water systems have identified environmentally preferable options, we show
75 that the total emissions of the assessed systems are unacceptable from a PB perspective. Using PB based
76 normalization (Bjørn and Hauschild, 2015) on LCA studies of urban water management in Denmark, we
77 show that even the most favourable solutions will generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that
78 constitute a large fraction of peoples total allowable emissions (Figure 2). This has not been reported by the
79 original studies that focus on comparisons between subsystems of urban water management (Brudler et
80 al., 2019, 2016; Delre et al., 2019; Godskesen et al., 2013). The challenge is even larger than shown here for
81 the thousands of cities globally that deal with more polluted water resources, more extensive treatment
82 and less efficient infrastructure than Denmark (Wang et al., 2019; WWAP, 2017).



83
84 Figure 2 Percentage of maximum allowable climate change impact for one person based on Planetary Boundary normalization of
85 emissions from urban water services in Denmark.

86

87 Climate change related environmental emissions are identified as a very important impact in all the
88 originally assessed studies and this is further backed by the PB based normalization, see [supplementary
89 material]. Climate change impacts are caused by GHG emissions, which mainly arise from direct emissions
90 of methane and nitrous oxide from the wastewater treatment plants; energy use for pumps and aeration in
91 water supply and wastewater treatment systems; and material use, transport, and construction in the
92 stormwater management and associated changes for climate adaptation.

93 The PB normalization indicates that impacts from urban water management exceed allowable thresholds.
94 While GHG emissions from water services account for close to 14% of allowable emissions (Fig. 2) it is
95 reported to contribute just 1% of total GHG emissions in Denmark (Nielsen et al., 2017). Exactly how many
96 emissions urban water management can be allowed to generate in a PB sustainable society is in the end a
97 political choice; but the 1% of all emissions from Nielsen et al., (2017) sets a realistic likely level. It is clear
98 that no gradual improvement of the existing paradigm with concrete and pipes will lead to an acceptable
99 emission level. We showcase how a single decision domain should be broken down to enable a thorough
100 analysis of where to put focus to increase sustainability. Even in a scenario where future electricity
101 production is entirely based on renewables, emissions from electricity use will not be reduced to zero (EEA,
102 2014; Godskesen et al., 2013), and reductions in emissions from material use and transport will be very
103 uncertain. The direct emission of methane and nitrous oxide from wastewater treatment will not be
104 directly affected, and emission reductions will for this part depend entirely on implementation of new
105 technical solutions not fully developed yet. For water management the solution could be to find
106 alternatives to using water as the primary carrier of pollutants in urban areas or to systematically recover
107 resources and energy in every urban water cycle across the globe (Belmeziti et al., 2015; Larsen et al.,
108 2016).

109 This is not just another call for reducing GHG emissions but a call to align objectives for and among the
110 SDGs and the Planetary Boundaries recognizing that all three pillars of sustainability are not equally

111 important and mutually tradable; A sustainable economy can only flourish within a sustainable society, and
112 a sustainable society can only exist at a healthy sustainable managed planet, governed in respect of the PB.
113 Challenges remain with linking the PB to LCA and using them on non-global systems (Ryberg et al., 2016;
114 Steffen et al., 2015); these need to be addressed (Randers et al., 2018). Nevertheless, for GHG emissions
115 the PB based normalization appears to be a strong framework to support not only relative environmental
116 impact of solutions to a problem, but also to indicate where fundamentally new local solutions are needed
117 to enable tackling of global problems. It has been demonstrated that peoples' habits need to change to
118 meet the PBs (Springmann et al., 2018), but people cannot directly influence their impact from public
119 services, like urban water management, so it is a societal challenge to deliver these while respecting the PB.

120 Conclusions

121 To answer the question raised in the heading: To meet UN SDG 6 while respecting the PBs, requires first
122 and foremost a dramatic reduction in GHG emissions from urban water management. It requires a total
123 decoupling of GHG emissions and energy and material use, as well as active carbon fixation and/or a
124 reduction of direct GHG emission from the systems, without these changes challenging other PBs not seen
125 as problematic today [supplementary material]. Importantly, changes need to happen at a rate
126 unprecedented for water infrastructure. LCA and PB based assessments are key methodologies for
127 highlighting 1) how far we are from being sustainable and 2) which subsystems require radical new
128 developments before urban water management will be sustainable.

129 Acknowledgements

130 Figure 1 Illustration adapted from unpublished work by Cecilie Thrysøe, Technical University of Denmark,
131 Department of Environmental Engineering.

132 References

133 Belmeziti, A., Cherqui, F., Tourne, A., Granger, D., Werey, C., Le Gauffre, P., Chocat, B., 2015. Transitioning

134 to sustainable urban water management systems: how to define expected service functions? *Civ. Eng.*
 135 *Environ. Syst.* 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286608.2015.1047355>

136 Bjørn, A., Hauschild, M.Z., 2015. Introducing carrying capacity-based normalisation in LCA: framework and
 137 development of references at midpoint level. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 20, 1005–1018.
 138 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-015-0899-2>

139 Brudler, S., Arnbjerg-Nielsen, K., Hauschild, M.Z., Ammitsøe, C., Hénonin, J., Rygaard, M., 2019. Life cycle
 140 assessment of point source emissions and infrastructure impacts of four types of urban stormwater
 141 systems. *Water Res.* 156, 383–394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2019.03.044>

142 Brudler, S., Arnbjerg-Nielsen, K., Hauschild, M.Z., Rygaard, M., 2016. Life cycle assessment of stormwater
 143 management in the context of climate change adaptation. *Water Res.* 106, 394–404.
 144 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2016.10.024>

145 Corominas, L., Foley, J., Guest, J.S., Hospido, A., Larsen, H.F., Morera, S., Shaw, A., 2013. Life cycle
 146 assessment applied to wastewater treatment: State of the art. *Water Res.* 47, 5480–5492.
 147 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2013.06.049>

148 Delre, A., Hoeve, M., Scheutz, C., 2019. Site-specific carbon footprints of Scandinavian wastewater
 149 treatment plants , using the life cycle assessment approach. *J. Clean. Prod.* 211, 1001–1014.
 150 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.11.200>

151 EEA, 2014. Trends and projections in Europe 2014, EEA Report 6/2014. <https://doi.org/10.2800/93693>

152 Fang, L.L., Valverde-Pérez, B., Damgaard, A., Plósz, B.G., Rygaard, M., 2016. Life cycle assessment as
 153 development and decision support tool for wastewater resource recovery technology. *Water Res.* 88,
 154 538–549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2015.10.016>

155 Ferriman, A., 2007. BMJ readers choose the “sanitary revolution” as greatest medical advance since 1840.

156 BMJ 334, 111.2-111. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39097.611806.DB>

157 Foley, J., de Haas, D., Hartley, K., Lant, P., 2010. Comprehensive life cycle inventories of alternative
 158 wastewater treatment systems. *Water Res.* 44, 1654–1666.
 159 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2009.11.031>

160 Godsken, B., Hauschild, M., Rygaard, M., Zambrano, K., Albrechtsen, H.J., 2013. Life-cycle and freshwater
 161 withdrawal impact assessment of water supply technologies. *Water Res.* 47, 2363–2374.
 162 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2013.02.005>

163 Green, C., 2010. Towards Sustainable Flood Risk Management. *Int. J. Disaster Risk Sci.* 1.
 164 <https://doi.org/10.3974/j.issn.2095-0055.2010.01.006>

165 Larsen, T.A., Hoffmann, S., Luthi, C., Truffer, B., Maurer, M., 2016. Emerging solutions to the water
 166 challenges of an urbanizing world. *Science* (80-.). 352, 928–933.
 167 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad8641>

168 Lundie, S., Peters, G.M., Beavis, P.C., 2004. Life Cycle Assessment for Sustainable Metropolitan Water
 169 Systems Planning. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 38, 3465–3473. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es034206m>

170 Nielsen, O.-K., Plejdrup, M.S., Winther, M., Nielsen, M., Gyldenkerne, S., Mikkelsen, M.H., Albrechtsen, R.,
 171 Thomsen, M., Hjelgaard, K., Fauser, P., Bruun, H.G., Johannsen, V.K., Nord-Larsen, T., Vesterdal, L.,
 172 Callesen, I., Caspersen, O.H., Rasmussen, E., Petersen, S.B., Baunbæk, L., Hansen, M., 2017.
 173 Denmark’s National Inventory Report 2017. Emission Inventories 1990-2015 - Submitted under the
 174 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol. Aarhus University,
 175 DCE – Danish Centre for Environment and Energy.

176 Randers, J., Rockström, J., Stoknes, P.E., Golüke, U., Collste, D., Cornell, S., 2018. Transformation is feasible -
 177 How to achieve the SustainableDevelopment Goals within Planetary Boundaries.

178 Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F.S., Lambin, E.F., Lenton, T.M., Scheffer, M.,
 179 Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H.J., Nykvist, B., De Wit, C.A., Hughes, T., Van Der Leeuw, S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin,
 180 S., Snyder, P.K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., Falkenmark, M., Karlberg, L., Corell, R.W., Fabry, V.J., Hansen,
 181 J., Walker, B., Liverman, D., Richardson, K., Crutzen, P., Foley, J.A., 2009. A safe operating space for
 182 humanity. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/461472a>

183 Ryberg, M.W., Owsianiak, M., Richardson, K., Hauschild, M.Z., 2016. Challenges in implementing a Planetary
 184 Boundaries based Life-Cycle Impact Assessment methodology. *J. Clean. Prod.* 139, 450–459.
 185 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.08.074>

186 Springmann, M., Clark, M., Mason-D'Croz, D., Wiebe, K., Bodirsky, B.L., Lassaletta, L., De Vries, W.,
 187 Vermeulen, S.J., Herrero, M., Carlson, K.M., Jonell, M., Troell, M., DeClerck, F., Gordon, L.J., Zurayk, R.,
 188 Scarborough, P., Rayner, M., Loken, B., Fanzo, J., Godfray, H.C.J., Tilman, D., Rockström, J., Willett, W.,
 189 2018. Options for keeping the food system within environmental limits. *Nature*.
 190 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0594-0>

191 Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S.E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E.M., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S.R.,
 192 de Vries, W., de Wit, C.A., Folke, C., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Mace, G.M., Persson, L.M., Ramanathan, V.,
 193 Meyers, B., Sörlin, S., 2015. Sustainability. Planetary boundaries: guiding human development on a
 194 changing planet. *Science* 347, 1259855. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259855>

195 UNEP, 2019. Emissions gap report 2019. Nairobi.

196 United Nations, 2015. General Assembly, Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable
 197 Development. <https://doi.org/10.1080/714003707>

198 Wang, X., Daigger, G., de Vries, W., Kroeze, C., Yang, M., Ren, N.-Q., Liu, J., Butler, D., 2019. Impact hotspots
 199 of reduced nutrient discharge shift across the globe with population and dietary changes. *Nat.*
 200 *Commun.* 10, 2627. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10445-0>

201 Wenzel, H., Larsen, H.F., Clauson-Kaas, J., Høiby, L., Jacobsen, B.N., 2008. Weighing environmental
202 advantages and disadvantages of advanced wastewater treatment of micro-pollutants using
203 environmental life cycle assessment. *Water Sci. Technol.* 57, 27–32.
204 <https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2008.819>

205 WWAP, 2017. The United Nations World Water Development Report 2017. Wastewater: The Untapped
206 Resource. Paris.

207